CITY OF REDMOND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

October 4, 2012

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review

in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade, Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Scott Waggoner

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Lara Sirois, Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Principle Planner; Gary Lee, Senior Planner

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp with Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chair David Scott Meade at 7:55 p.m.

MINUTES

MR. KRUEGER MADE SOME CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 16, 2012 MEETING. ON PAGE THREE, UNDER COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS, THE SECOND SENTENCE SHOULD READ A "SHARED USE" FOR PEDESTRIANS AND CARS. ON PAGE 7, MS. SIROIS WAS NOTED AS "MR."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS AMENDED OF THE AUGUST 16, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120041, Value Village Retail

Description: Proposed loading dock addition with updated façade and landscaping

Location: 16771 Redmond Way

Applicant: Joe Danahou with DDG Architects

Prior Review Date: 09/06/12

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, glee@redmond.gov or 425-556-2418

Mr. Lee noted that this was the second pre-application meeting for the Value Village remodel. The applicant has responded to the comments of the DRB and Mr. Lee believes the applicant did a good job. His only concerns are about the display panel, about which he would like some more information from the applicant. Also, Mr. Lee said a condition regarding the landscaping could be put in place when the project comes back for final approval.

Brooke Dayton-Dittrich presented on behalf of the applicant. She noted that she has responded to all five comments from the DRB made at the last meeting. The applicant has further addressed what the blank wall on the project will show. That back wall, on the north side, was initially reserved for an open art installation or another structural piece. The applicant has decided on extending a canopy over and moving a sign to the northeast corner so as to make it more of a prominent entrance. Some of the landscaping is there, with some trees, but the applicant says in the future, there is a City plan for that intersection to change in the future. The panels have been pulled down on the blank wall, as well, to create a division between spaces and textures. There are some suggestions for art installations, but the applicant believes what she is presenting is more of a permanent fix.

Mr. Krueger clarified that the art display panel shown previously to the DRB was now not the preferred alternative. The applicant agreed, and said the change allows the project to incorporate more of the actual façade into the blank wall, drawing it down and integrating it more into the design. Mr. Krueger asked about the parapet that wraps around the corner above the corner door, and wondered if that parapet did not extend further in earlier drawings, past the second door. The applicant said that was not the case, but she would be open to that change if needed. The applicant confirmed with Mr. Lee that her next move would be to submit an application for administrative modification.

The applicant next addressed the issue of the trash containers, and how the DRB had asked them to be enclosed. The proposal is to move the containers back further and enclose three of them to create a screen. Also, the shipping containers would be moved back so they could be accessed from the store. That would allow more room for movement in the back of the building and would screen the back of the building from the trail. The applicant is proposing more of an organic edge to the site. The arbor vitae initially proposed has been removed and more native plants have been included. The applicant was a bit confused with the DRB's direction, which involved a request for screening but also a request for an access point. Mr. Lee said the landscaping could be dealt with later on. The applicant said irrigation would be included.

The DRB had asked for more of a continuation of the façade from before. Thus, a linear painting pattern has been proposed, with a continuation of the orange and gray colors on the south façade. A canopy has been added over the FedEx area, creating an entrance there. A back alley wall was not painted, in that it is not visible and accessible only via elevation. The design will keep Value Village as the dominant feature in the back of the building and its own focal point.

On Building B, the applicant has proposed continuing the dark gray color all around the building, with orange accents. The shingle roof has been continued down on the areas that are protruding. This should create a cohesive front and back look to the building, creating more of the entrance the DRB had asked for on the path. On the side of the project, the mechanical equipment is better shielded and the sign has been moved.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if the chain-link fence would be kept on the back side of the project next to the trail. The
 applicant said the fence would stay, simply as a safety measure.
- Will Nelson with Legacy, the ownership group of the property, said there have been ongoing safety issues in the back of the property. Employees have had to move their cars to the front lot due to vandalism. Lights have been added, but the safety issues have remained. Thus, the applicant would like to keep the access to the trail to just one entry area so as to try to keep control of the situation.
- Mr. Krueger said he did not have a problem with the fence. He said that a better-looking fence might be an idea, such as a brown fence that could blend in with all the new landscaping work being done.
- Mr. Nelson said the original idea was to take the fence out. He would like to see how the plant life starts to grow around that fencing area to figure out what it will look like, and said he would keep an eye on that part of the project.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the four containers in the back of the building, and if they were painted. The applicant confirmed there were two green and two white containers. Mr. Nelson said those colors are controlled by the tenant, but as a landlord, there could be a push to address that idea.
- Mr. Lee added that the containers often move and are transported away from the building quite often.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the trash enclosure and if it would be surrounded by a chain-link fence. The applicant
 noted that the current enclosure does have a chain-link fence. She held back on the idea of putting in
 a concrete wall, which might not be as easily portable.
- Mr. Nelson added that there is a long-term plan for the back of this building, including the addition of a Sound Transit route, and so the plan is for more of a temporary structure. He said slats could be added to the chain-link fence. Mr. Lee said chain-link and slats were not the preferred alternative.
- The applicant said initially, the fence was more solid, but not a CMU enclosure. Mr. Lee said more
 definition on that issue should be part of the final application.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about bringing the colors around the building and how it would be painted. The applicant admitted that the entire building would not be painted, but the painting has been extended. The plan is to keep the project in budget and not continue with the higher-end materials down the alley. Painting and overhangs have been added in more visible areas.
- Mr. Palmquist said overall, the project looks much more complete. He said the proposal will help in the long run in that the applicant would not have to do too much when the back of this building becomes the front, as the neighborhood changes.
- He liked the idea presented for the blank wall. He said, regarding the landscaping, there were certain Parks Department requirements.

Mr. Meade:

- Said the project should come back for approval. Mr. Lee confirmed with the Board that there were no major issues.
- Mr. Lee told the applicant to submit the administrative modification application and come back to the DRB. The applicant said she was looking forward to that, and both sides thanked each other.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120002, Valley Furniture

Description: Construction of a 5 – 6 story mixed-use development with approximately 270 units

Location: 8200 – 164th Ave NE Prior Review Date: 04/05/12 Applicant: Lizabeth Soldano

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee said this was the second pre-application for this project. It has progressed since it was first presented to the DRB, but Mr. Lee still has some concerns about the materials. A lot of hardy panel has been used. There is also a concern about the appliqué around the window. The corner element needs to pop out more, in staff's opinion. Staff has recommended pulling out the canopy a bit further, to the property line where possible. Color samples have been provided, but the colors are difficult to distinguish.

Doug Oberst with BCRA, the architect on the project, spoke on behalf of the applicant. The applicant has developed the concept of the site using a modern aesthetic, keeping a clean line and simple forms while adding some playful colors and a warm, youthful feel. It is believed that the clientele for this site will be younger, Generation Y urban professional, and this design should respond well to their expectations. It provides a good urban living feel for downtown Redmond. The challenges of the City's design guidelines and Zoning Code have been met, in the applicant's opinion. Yet, there are some inherent site constraints. The applicant is trying to set this project apart from other similar projects in Redmond.

Randy Gould, the project designer, next spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Gould said that he has focused on the comments from the last meeting with the DRB and responded to them. The applicant says the project has a smooth, clean look with fiber cement siding. It may or may not be hardy panel. Other materials have been researched. The applicant plans to accentuate the corner element Mr. Lee mentioned with a change in materials. The concern over the appliqué, which the applicant referred to as offset window panels, involves an idea to provide some asymmetry in the way the windows are set up. The DRB had requested a staggering of the windows. The applicant did not want to move too many of the windows around, but the offset panels could address the concern of variation and shape on the front of the building. The applicant has added horizontal banding to break up the façade as well.

The applicant is trying to address staff concerns that this building should not look like other buildings in Redmond. Thus, there is a focus on a more modern look, so concrete has been used at the base of the building and smoother, cleaner surfaces have been selected for the siding. The corner element is a type of corrugated metal. The applicant has also modulated the roofline. The balconies add to the modulation on the front of the building. A modern railing design has been proposed. Keeping with staff requirements for the tripartite requirement, the applicant has added a band that separates the top of the building and

changed the color in this part of the design. The effect is a bottom, middle, and top which are separated and attractive. The colors did not come out well on the prints, however.

The applicant has tried to open up the street-level corner of the building. The building, at the two sides of the entry, steps back about three to four feet from the rest of the structure. A broader sidewalk has been created there. In the landscape plan, the applicant has proposed a change in the paving at that corner to delineate between the public sidewalk and the transition area into the building. There are entries on two sides to prevent having a dead corner. Along the north side of the building along 83rd, the applicant has provided ground-level access to the units. Above all, the applicant is trying to create a modern, clean look that is fresh and new.

Andy Rasmussen with Weisman Design Group next presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant with regard to the landscape plan. He spoke about the ground level of the project, which is about four and a half feet above grade. The challenge is to make it feel like it is activated but also modern. Rather than a heavy base with stoops and pillars and a traditional street frontage, the idea is to have a floating deck system. There is a requirement for access to the entries, so there is a floating staircase with a lighter metal material and landscaping flowing underneath it. The stairs are shared by two decks so there are not numerous staircases all the way down the street. The landscape becomes the driver of the space. There is a 25-foot setback in this area with a five-foot landscape strip along the street that will be fully planted. Also, there would be 14 feet of landscaping between the building and the street, creating a wide, generous space. The plan is for more of a modern, park-like setting that has a lush feel but also some structure. The trees are related to the elements of the building, flanking the decks. The landscaping would be terraced planting materials.

A shared amenities space has been proposed, with the inside and outside relating to each other. The space has an angled wall that faces southwest and allows for interaction with a connected plaza. The common space in the building and part of the main entry would have materials and walls that relate to that angled wall, thus carrying out the design motif throughout the entire building. From a pedestrian view of the outside of the building, there would be a series of expressions of that design with low evergreen hedges and larger flowering plants behind them. There would be some seating elements at the corners to create a lush landscape at the east and north sides of the site. On the 164th side, retail frontage has been proposed, and so there are some benches and pots. However, this area is more pedestrian-oriented and there is no parking. Perennials and ornamental grasses have been proposed for the front, with some higher plantings around the deck to anchor them but still allow them to "float." The decks are only four and a half feet above the street, so there is a street relationship that is pleasant but different than usual. There is no parking on a few sides of the building, so amenity space relating to people getting out of their cars would not be appropriate. The applicant asked for some feedback.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked the applicant to go through the color palette. The applicant said the color graduates from darker to lighter from the bottom to the top. At the base, there is concrete. There is a prominent vertical color of the building, and a tan color for the decks behind the railings.
- The top of the building above the horizontal building is a lighter color. Playful colors have been proposed for the horizontal bands. The length of the bands varies across the building to provide some variation. A rusty, red color will wrap around the building, most likely part of the panel system.
- The metal material proposed at the corner element would have a metallic sheen, but it will change depending on exterior light, creating some nice variation. That language is repeated at other corners of the building in a more toned-down way so as to highlight the main corner.
- Mr. Krueger asked the applicant to go around the building to see other elevations, and noted that the
 first application on this project was very conceptual. He said this was the first view since that preapplication, and asked for more details on the treatment to the south and other design issues.
- The applicant began on the west elevation, which is the main retail side on 164th. The concept at the base, at the previous meeting, involved a canopy that ran all the way across. That has now been broken up into smaller pieces. The base of the building comes up between those pieces and the canopies follow the rhythm of the building as it goes down the street.

- The corner element on the northwest corner, the main corner, is echoed on the southwest corner. The proposal is to have an open storefront at the bottom. One accent at the retail level comes out from the parking and residential area up above.
- Transitioning around the building, on the north side, there is an effort to tie the middle of the building
 across the top with a band that runs across. There are ground-level entries for the units along this
 side with landscaping along the front, with attention paid to the modulation requirements needed.
- At the northeast corner, the decks have been pulled back a bit, such that the corner is not jutting out into the setback at that corner.
- On the east side, because it is on the residential street and is a bit smaller, the applicant did not feel it
 was necessary to vary the decks as much because it is a smaller building on that side. However,
 there is a continued pattern of bands running across the top with a different color.
- On the south side, the corner elements come out like the other corners. On the end of the building that faces the other properties, and in front of this elevation, there are townhouses that are about two and a half to three stories high.
- There is a smaller building in this area as well, but the zoning would allow for more development. The building is stepped back an extra five feet beyond the setback to create better articulation on the face of the structure with the balconies. There are three step-backs on the south side.
- The courtyard breaks this end of the building up on the south side, so people driving by on 164th would not see one face, but two sections broken up. The courtyard sits between these sections with landscaping and open space.
- Mr. Krueger asked about what appears to be a difference in the materials from the ground level to the main building. The applicant reiterated that the ground level, and thus the courtyard and the ground floor units, are four and a half feet above grade. This is due to water table issues.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the first floor units were using a different color scheme along the street. The applicant said he has not settled on a color, but it will coordinate with the concrete color to form the base of the building. There would not be a change in materials.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Was curious about the materials on the outside. Mr. Lee had noted there was a lot of hardy panel, but Mr. Waggoner said it appeared to be almost all metal-clad. The applicant said the siding would be, in large part, hardy panel.
- The applicant said the reason for the material choice was to create a smooth surface instead of doing a lot of reveals via panels or lap siding. The visual breakup of the building is achieved not through changing materials, but by changing the shape and color scheme. The parts of the building that step out are one color, but the recesses and the balconies are different colors.
- The applicant said the band material has not been finalized, but it would be continuous and clean, most likely some sort of metal channel, which covering the end of the deck.
- The applicant said the corners have some metal added to anchor those elements.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the residential stoops and the stair landings presented, which he thought
 would be a cool idea. He asked if extending landscaping under those stoops would be realistic,
 seeing as how they would be covered. He wondered if the stoops would be solid floors or grating.
- The applicant said that detail is still in the works. The idea would be to use perforated metal on the stairs to allow for some light to reach the plant material under it. The applicant was not clear on whether plants could survive under the decks themselves. Plant material is used as a screen around the decking areas.
- The applicant said the transfer slab of the decks would cantilever out to create the bottom deck areas, and would be a solid material. The decks up above could be solid or a metal grate material. The idea is to have the upper decks floating and hovering above the project.
- Mr. Waggoner likes the big corner element idea, which could create an identity for the project. He said the street level looks fairly dark at the main corner, which may be the result of the thickness and dark color of the awning band that wrap around. He suggested a transparent canopy to allow light to hit the ground in this area.
- Mr. Waggoner noted that the same dark band extends along the rest of the frontage, creating some continuity along the length of the building. He asked if the canopies could involve some solid, opaque material.

- He said the corner, especially, would be the place for translucent material, but the same idea would apply around the retail frontage of the project. Changing the head heights of the canopy over the sidewalk could create some interest and pop at the retail zones.
- Beyond that, Mr. Waggoner said the general character of the building was cool. He liked the modern, tight skin approach to the look and feel of the project. He said having a more metallic skin wrapped around the building via the horizontal band might be a better way to appeal to the more industrial motif that would appeal to the tech-savvy demographic the applicant is hoping to attract.
- Mr. Meade asked Mr. Waggoner about the photos of some of the other units referred to the in the
 packet and their use of horizontal bands. Mr. Meade said the applicant should dive more deeply into
 the idea of a colored horizontal band.
- Mr. Waggoner noted another photo that introduced the translucent canopy concept he mentioned earlier and a good use of glass.

Mr. Meade:

- Suggested the applicant should look more closely at some of the images and case studies provided in the packet to create more appeal for the main corner of the proposal. Glazing patterns and adding pattern would help add some excitement.
- Mr. Meade said pushing the project towards a bolder horizontal band would make him happier. He said the glazing patterns fall short of what they could be. He wanted the applicant to make more cues from the case studies provided.
- Mr. Meade echoed Mr. Waggoner's idea for some different siding texture, involving color variations and different vertical elements. He said the applicant was headed down the right path, but said the project needs to be cranked up a couple notches to get where it needs to be.
- The applicant said the challenge for this building was that it was taller than some of the case studies referred to, and had to fit in some residential units.
- Mr. Meade suggested, with the way the glazing is rendered on the corner, the applicant could find a
 dark window framing product that could help blend with the siding more so as to make one statement
 rather than a number of statements.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Likes the modern idea, and feels like the body of the building and the first floor are successful in that regard. However, the tower element echoes every other project in Redmond in that it is very traditional. He suggested creating a clean corner with the material rather than trim.
- Mr. Palmquist asked the applicant to focus the design energy on the corner element. The rest of the building could use some minor tweaks, but the corner needs some punching up to get to the modern, clean aesthetic that is achieved on the rest of the building.
- He echoed Mr. Waggoner's sentiment about the translucent canopy. Glass, cantilevered out, with minimal support, could provide a more modern look, especially on the north side of the building.
- Mr. Palmquist echoed Mr. Meade's concern over the white windows up against dark metal. He suggested finding a darker window color that matches the main body material so the frame melts away.
- Mr. Palmquist said the paving at the corners was a great idea, but he suggested taking the project's paving out all the way out to the curb and the landscaping at that corner. In that way, the project would not have a dividing line where the sidewalk runs by. By putting that line in, the applicant creates two different spaces.
- Mr. Palmquist said, at the corners, the applicant should take the paving for the inset area and bring it all the way out to the curb and landscape buffer to create one space.
- In general, Mr. Palmquist said the rest of the project is very good. He said the window insets were a fine detail and he likes the varying of the horizontal bands.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested that a step-back in the building where it meets the tower, even only a foot, could create a distinct separation that would look good. The applicant pointed out that a portion of the building steps out in front of the tower. Mr. Palmquist said, even with that slight step, it still appears that there are two materials butting together. He suggested a bigger step-back.
- The applicant noted, in response to the canopy concern, that the idea to break up the canopy might provide some transparency. He hoped for the building to be fairly minimal, which is why the steel canopy was suggested. Mr. Palmquist said that was fine, but something lighter than the steel channel at the main corners would be a good idea.

- Mr. Krueger reiterated that the lighter materials should be used at the corners, but the heavier
 materials could be used in other parts of the building. Mr. Palmquist said the size of the material is the
 main concern. He suggested cantilevering to avoid tie-backs.
- Mr. Palmquist noted that the canopy is set below the second floor, and suggested it might be stronger if the canopy popped up to the second floor. Other DRB members agreed. He suggested continuing the soffit material to create the minimalist look at the canopy.
- The applicant noted that he had considered the idea of varying the height of the canopy, and had considered putting some glass above it around the retail areas. Mr. Palmquist said that could work if the floor height was a bit higher. He noted that a larger step-back at the corner element could help make it more distinct.
- The applicant confirmed that the canopy at the corner should move up and become lighter, creating a better base at the corner element. Mr. Meade agreed, and said if the canopy was pushed up to get as much as possible, there could be some reflective light surface beneath it.
- Mr. Waggoner said Mr. Meade's suggestion would provide a better look from the street, as well.
- Mr. Meade asked if the tower was prominent enough. Mr. Palmquist said there might be a Code limitation to the height, and step-backs could help in that regard. He likes the height of the tower with a void on either side to set it apart. But, if there is room for more height, he would suggest popping it up a bit to create some vertical separation for the tower.
- Mr. Meade said creating a channel piece in another color or darker color could create a fake shadow line and help with the step-back concept.
- Mr. Waggoner suggested that there should be some activity inside the main entrance, a concierge desk or some furniture elements, to avoid having a blank room right inside the main entrance.
- The applicant said the intention was to have a very active zone here and a large staircase.
- Mr. Meade noted that, on some of the case studies presented, there was an alternating rhythm of the colored bands. He asked if one band, as presented in this proposal, was enough.
- Mark Weisman from Weisman Design Group spoke to the Board at this point, and noted that the design presented was a response to the City's desire for a tripartite scheme. He did not want to junk up a clean design. He did not think the soffit elements fit the modern appeal of the building.
- Mr. Palmquist said he was not attached to the soffits, as such. At the same time, if the soffits were removed, that left a lot of work to do. The applicant said he would be looking at how the windows are dealt with, how the corner treatment is strengthened, and how the banding relates to that corner.
- Mr. Meade said more banding might be a better choice. If the bands were removed completely, that would create too simple of a corner. The applicant said three bands might be a suggestion.
- The applicant said there were concerns over modulation and roof stepping, which the City requires.

 Mr. Lee noted that the materials need a lot of work, as well.
- Mr. Krueger said the upper level was a concern for him, in that it does not resolve properly. He liked the suggestions of his fellow Board members to help solve the issues around the corner element. He also liked the landscaping added to the project by the applicant. He noted that the colors on the applicant's boards versus the colors on the drawings are much richer.
- Mr. Meade again referred to some of the applicant's case studies and asked the applicant to find some innovative ways to apply the tripartite logic to this project and some different rhythms in the design. He said the window patterns could be changed to create more asymmetry and more direction to the project overall.
- Mr. Meade said this project was off to a great start, but asked the applicant to continue to refine the proposal. He asked Mr. Lee if he had any concerns.
- Mr. Lee asked about the materials and the potential to add glazing to the site. If the glazing was not changed significantly, Mr. Lee said the material proposed for this application still included a lot of paneling. He said adding significant glazing could help. He wanted some clarification.
- Mr. Meade said on the larger tower masses, the windows are undersized. He noted that the red
 proposed could be darker, as well. He said the biggest piece missing was that the windows were too
 residential in size and formation. The idea is to create an edgier look with more glazing.
- Mr. Weisman suggested changing the mullion pattern on the windows as a way to help. The applicant said the windows are six feet wide and five feet high. Mr. Meade said adding glazing would help, and suggested a darker, recessive color in the paneling around the windows.
- Mr. Waggoner said this project is dark. Mr. Meade said a deeper, recessed window piece could help. Mr. Lee said that direction helped, but noted that if just a bit of glazing were added, it would not even be close to the case studies the DRB has been referring to, and a lot of panel would be involved.

- Mr. Palmquist noted that the building is big, but if the corners could look better, the hardy panel could look okay through the rest of the building. He said, however, on the longer elevations, some metal paneling could be added in some recessed areas to break up the massing. Mr. Meade said different texture and color could help, as well.
- The applicant said he could work on ways to achieve the impression of more window space, but the size of the window could not be much taller. Mr. Meade suggested a wider window, if possible.
- In general, Mr. Palmquist said this project was off to a good start. He hoped the applicant could take
 the DRB's suggestions, explore some options, and come back with some new designs.
- The applicant summarized that the corner elements, the canopies, the addition of glazing, and some added texture are the issues the DRB would like him to concentrate on. Mr. Palmquist said the roofline needed work, as well.
- The applicant asked if the paving could indeed go out to the curb line, as Mr. Palmquist suggested. Mr. Lee said that could be a challenge, in that if the City had to repair it in the future, a patching job would be involved that would not look good. Both sides thanked each other for their time.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Lee asked the DRB to consider a project near City Hall that had been approved in 2007, was foreclosed on, and now is in the process of being resold. The project approvals have expired, so a new application must be made. He asked the DRB if building what was approved in 2007 would be okay, or if the pre-application process should be undertaken again. Staff is ready to approve it if this is what the applicant wants to build. Mr. Palmquist said this is a good-looking building and he would support Mr. Lee's proposal. Mr. Meade noted that this project had multiple iterations, and was a very tight site. What is on the site now is a dinosaur. He asked the DRB if, on the new proposal, if the trellises on the project looked clunky. He suggested keeping the outriggers but getting rid the trellises. Mr. Lee said that would not be a big change. Mr. Palmquist said he would be okay with the applicant finding a new soffit, perhaps something that is one big plane for the roof.

Mr. Fischer asked if the massing, colors and materials were all appropriate. The DRB members said yes, but Mr. Meade said that the truss could go away. Mr. Lee suggested that the applicant could come in for one pre-application. Mr. Waggoner noted that the roof elements on the towers could use some work. Mr. Fischer summarized that the design could be cleaned up and not as busy. Mr. Palmquist asked if Mr. Lee could pass along the DRB's comments and have the project come in for approval. Mr. Lee said the applicant would actually have to apply, but Mr. Fischer said this project could come in and get approval on its first visit to the Board. He noted that did not happen often, but pointed out this project has already been approved once. Mr. Lee said that the changes proposed by the DRB are minor, and a full re-design is not needed. Mr. Meade said it would be good to have the new Board members have some input, and there could be a couple of tweaks to reflect the new real estate market. Mr. Lee thanked the DRB members and said he would pass along their comments.

DRAFT DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RULES

Mr. Fischer noted that there have been staff discussions and some minor tweaks to Attachment A of the Design Review Board Rules. These rules were discussed at the September 20th meeting of the DRB. Mr. Krueger had some questions at that time about the section that addresses what happens when the Chair or Vice-Chair are not present. That has been addressed in the new draft. Mr. Fischer asked for a recommendation to approve these rules so as to move them forward to the City Council. On page 3, paragraph B, Mr. Krueger asked about a phrase referring to a *concurrence of a majority of the members of the Board present not disqualified and voting shall be necessary to determine any question before the Board.* Mr. Palmquist clarified with an example, such as the case where his company was presenting an application to the Board. In that situation, he would be disqualified from voting on the project. But there would have to be a majority of who was left on the Board to provide a quorum. Mr. Krueger suggested it was an awkward sentence and perhaps some commas should be added. Mr. Fischer further clarified that the DRB has to have four members to constitute a quorum. However, if there are only four members and one has to recuse himself, as in Mr. Palmquist's example, the DRB would not be precluded from taking action. The majority would be taken from the members remaining. Mr. Fischer said this language is

consistent with what other Boards do in the City. Mr. Krueger said the language was fine, if everyone else understands it.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF ATTACHMENT A OF THE DRAFT DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RULES TO CITY COUNCIL. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:46 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

November 15, 2012	
MINUTES APPROVED ON	RECORDING SECRETARY